

REMARKS/RESTRICTION RESPONSE

Claims 19 to 30 are added, and therefore claims 17 to 30 are pending and being considered, since claims 10 to 16 are withdrawn in response to the restriction requirement.

Claims 10 to 16 were classed as Group I, and claims 17 and 18 were classed as Group II, and restriction was required as between Groups I and II.

Claims 17 and 18 are elected with traverse.

It is believed that the consideration of the method claims does not impose any additional burden on the Office, and the subject matter of claims 10 to 16 is common to claims 17 and 18. It is therefore respectfully requested that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

As to the objection to the drawings, the objection is traversed. The specification and the rewritten claims make plain that there is wireless communication between the systems. This is plainly described and disclosed throughout the specification and is also plainly shown in Figures 1 and 2 (see communication symbol between antennas). Nothing more is required by the Rules. The Rules (see 1.81 and 1.83) also make plain that if something is understandable without a drawing then it need not be drawn. Wireless communications via radiowaves are plainly understood by a person having ordinary skill in the art. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 11, 13, 14, 17 and 18 were rejected as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

While the rejections may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters, the following is submitted:

To better clarify the claims for the Examiner, and even though claims 10 to 17 are withdrawn with traverse, certain of these claims (like claims 17 and 18) have been rewritten to make plain that the air interface is as defined throughout the specification, namely “wireless communication”. As to the remaining comments, it is believed that the claims are definite, especially in view of the disclosure of the specification, including the drawings. Claims 17 and 18 have likewise been rewritten. Any reading of the Substitute Specification

makes plain that support for the claims is provided, for example, including at page 3, line 15 to page 11, line 15, as well as the "Summary" at page 1, line 26 to page 2, line 30.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the indefiniteness claims be withdrawn.

New claims 19 to 24 and new claims 25 to 30 do not add any new matter, and are supported by the present application, including the specification. Claims 19 to 24 depend from device claim 18, and claims 25 to 30 depend from device claim 17. Claims 19 to 24 and 25 to 30 are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims 18 and 17.

Accordingly, pending and considered claims 17 to 30 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the restriction has been addressed and traversed, and that the objections and rejections have been obviated, and should therefore be withdrawn. It is therefore respectfully requested that the present application issue as early as possible.

Dated: 2/18/08

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

By: Gerard A. Messina

Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646